



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,857	07/31/2003	Robert Wiest	SRE-0004-US	9086
36183 7590 03/20/2008 PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP 875 15th Street, NW Washington, DC 20005				
EXAMINER				
CARTER, CANDICE D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/20/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/630,857

**Applicant(s)**

WIEST ET AL.

**Examiner**

CANDICE D. CARTER

**Art Unit**

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/ISD/IC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/15/2005 11/15/2004 7/13/2004 3/23/2004



### DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is a First Action Non-Final on the merits. Claims 1-21, as originally filed, are currently pending and have been considered below.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9-11, 15, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (5,794,207) in view of Mangin et al. (6,078, 890).**

As per claim 1, Walker et al. discloses "A system for transacting business between a solicitor and a business comprising:

a server used by a business and being accessible by a solicitor" (col. 8, line 42-52 discloses communications between buyers and sellers being conducted using a central controller where a buyer who wishes to make a purchase accesses the central controller located at a remote server; in the instant case, the buyer is the solicitor as he is soliciting the business of sellers accessing the system);

"and a contract evaluator housed on the server, wherein the contract evaluator receives input data from the solicitor and determines at a second stage whether the input data as a whole falls within one or more specific pathways of further data evaluation" (col. 18, line 17-26 discloses evaluating the CPO by extracting data

from the data input fields to determine the appropriate subject area that CPO would fall under, where the appropriate subject area is the specific pathway).

Walker et al., however, fails to explicitly disclose “determines at a first stage whether the input data is complete to receive further evaluation”. Mangin et al, discloses a method and system for automated health care renewal and quality assessment having a stage wherein input data is determined to be complete. (col. 4, line 6-11 discloses an electronic form determining whether the provider failed to fully input all requested data into the form).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and apparatus designed to facilitate buyer driven conditional purchase offers of Walker et al. to include the electronic form notifying a user of incomplete data input fields as disclosed by Mangin et al. in order to facilitate the proper processing of the form and the information associated with it.

Claims 10 and 18 recite equivalent limitations to claim 1 and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 2, Walker et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “if the input data is not complete at the first stage then the solicitor is alerted to complete the input data”.

Mangin et al. discloses a method and system for automated health care renewal and quality assessment having an alert operable to notify the solicitor to complete the

input data (col. 4, line 9-11 discloses that an alert is provided to inform the provider of the failure to complete all data fields)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and apparatus designed to facilitate buyer driven conditional purchase offers of Walker et al. to include the electronic form notifying a user of incomplete data input fields as disclosed by Mangin et al in order to facilitate the proper processing of the form and the information associated with it.

Claims 11 and 19 recite equivalent limitations to claim 2 and are, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 6, Walker et al. further discloses "one or more of the specific pathways accepts the input of the solicitor and signals the solicitor that a contract has been formed". (col. 18, line 16-17 discloses the central controller extracting data from the CPO and col. 19, line 42-45 discloses the seller adding an indication to the CPO that the contract is agreed to, where this indication would, inherently, be communicated to the solicitor)

Claim 15 recites equivalent limitations to claim 6 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim7, Walker et al. discloses "one of the one or more specific pathways presents the solicitor with a counteroffer" (col. 22, line 40-42 discloses a seller responding to a solicitor with a counteroffer).

Claim 16 recites equivalent limitations to claim 7 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 8, Walker et al further discloses "one of the one or more specific pathways required manual intervention by a person who evaluates the input data" (col. 31, line 4-5 discloses that transaction data can be sent to third party arbiters to settle disputes, where the third party arbiter is the human intervention required to complete the dispute resolution).

Claim 17 recites equivalent limitations to claim 8 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 9, Walker et al. discloses "one of the one or more specific pathways signals the solicitor that a contract cannot be formed" (col. 9, line 45-50 discloses that a seller may respond to a CPO by sending a counteroffer through the central controller, where, by sending the counteroffer, the central controller is notifying the solicitor that the contract cannot be formed because the seller did not agree to the original terms of the contract).

**4. Claims 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. in view of Mangin et al. and further in view of Wolff et al. (5,774,887).**

As per claim 3, The Walker et al. and Mangin et al. combination discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the solicitor is directed to data that is not complete".

Wolff et al. discloses a customer service electronic form generating system directing a user to data that is not complete (col. 9, line 14-20 discloses highlighting the fields of the form that must be completed by the user).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and apparatus designed to facilitate buyer driven conditional purchase offers of the Walker et al. and Mangin et al. combination to include the highlighted data fields as taught by Wolff et al. in order to ensure that the user understands which data fields must be completed.

Claim 12 recites equivalent limitations to claim 3 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

**5. Claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. in view of Mangin et al. and further in view of Case et al. (6,510,418).**

As per claim 4, The Walker et al. and Mangin et al. combination discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "each of the one or more specific pathways has a prerequisite of a given range of variables".

Case et al. discloses a method and apparatus for detecting and deterring the submission of similar offers in a commerce system having "a prerequisite of a given range of variables" (col. 6, line 36-48 discloses unacceptable similarity ranges indicating a range for the corresponding term within which similar buyer offers may be rejected, where the acceptable range is any value falling outside of the unacceptable similarity range).



Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and apparatus designed to facilitate buyer driven conditional purchase offers of the Walker et al. and Mangin et al. combination to include the prerequisite of a given range of variables as taught by Case et al. since such would filter out all offers/counteroffers that are unacceptable.

Claims 13 and 20 recite equivalent limitations to claim 4 and are, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 5, The Walker et al. and Mangin et al. combination discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "a default pathway is followed if the input data does not fall within any of the one or more specific pathways" (col. 9, line 4-16 discloses that if an offer is determined to fall outside of the acceptable offer range then an alternate or default process is followed, where the default process could be to reject the offer, charge a surcharge to process the offer, or providing a warning, or suspending future privileges of the buyer).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and apparatus designed to facilitate buyer driven conditional purchase offers of the Walker et al. and Mangin et al. combination to include the default pathway as taught by Case et al. since such would deter users from submitting offers that fall outside of an acceptable range.

Claims 14 and 21 recite equivalent limitations to claim 5 and are, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Benson et al. (7,277,861) discloses an insurance policy and renewal method and system. Conklin et al. (6,338,050) discloses a system and method for providing and updating user supplied context for a negotiations system. Balson et al. (2003/0033240) discloses an integrated electronic exchange of structured contracts with dynamic risk-based transaction permissioning.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CANDICE D. CARTER whose telephone number is (571) 270-5105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7:30am- 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CDC

/John G. Weiss/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629